

2007 Current Fiscal Year Report: Drug Control Research, Data, and Evaluation Committee

Report Run Date: 06/06/2019 03:37:03 AM

1. Department or Agency		2. Fiscal Year	
Office of National Drug Control Policy		2007	
3. Committee or Subcommittee		3b. GSA Committee No.	
Drug Control Research, Data, and Evaluation Committee		1955	
4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?	5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date
No	02/14/2006	02/14/2008	
8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?	8b. Specific Termination Authority	8c. Actual Term Date	
Yes		09/30/2007	
9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year	10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?	10b. Legislation Pending?	
Terminate	No	Enacted	
11. Establishment Authority	Agency Authority		
12. Specific Establishment Authority	13. Effective Date	14. Committee Type	14c. Presidential?
	11/09/1994	Continuing	No
15. Description of Committee National Policy Issue Advisory Board			
16a. Total Number of Reports	No Reports for this Fiscal Year		
17a. Open Meetings and Dates	17b. Closed	17c. Partially Closed	Other Activities
No Meetings	0	0	0

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$0.00	\$0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

Chartered to advise the Director of ONDCP on areas including substance abuse treatment modalities, drug enforcement technology, drug-related data collection, analysis and evaluation, among other issues, the Committee continues to advise ONDCP on the following: (1) a Federal drug-related data needs assessment; (2) identifying principles for establishing national data policy priorities; (3) recommendations regarding the Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center's (CTAC) efforts to develop research and development for the law enforcement community; and (4) demand reduction issues such as treatment in the justice system, prevention, and the impact of managed care and treatment.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

During FY2003, ONDCP restructured the Committee. The Committee's charter was updated and renewed and the membership was changed. A new panel was proposed beginning in FY2004 for the Committee. The panel is currently in the process of being vetted through ONDCP's Office of Legal Counsel. The new panel will not be officially appointed until the ethics review process has been completed. The Committee's representation continues to reflect a distinguished expert group from the scientific, engineering, law enforcement, treatment, and associated international scientific communities. The Committee members'expertise reflect three general areas: (1) Research and Evaluation; (2) the Science and Technology; and (3) the Prevention, Treatment and Medical Research. The members of the Committee provide a balanced venue where academia, non-profit bipartisan grassroots organizations, treatment programs, and researchers are heard from. A panel of fifteen nominees approved by the Director of ONDCP are in the process of being reviewed and will add substantive expertise drug-related crime and violence, and additional balance to the Committee.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The Drug Control Research, Data, and Evaluation Committee will continue to operate in a general advisory capacity to the Director of ONDCP.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

The Committee is comprised of a wide range of individuals, representing various groups, points of views, experience, and expertise in research, treatment, drug policy, and other critical areas. Together, they provide a unique and comprehensive perspective on issues that are unavailable from one single source.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

N/A

21. Remarks

The Committee is developing evaluation criteria to help ONDCP determine the effectiveness and efficiency of ONDCP programs and policy.

Designated Federal Officer

Daniel R. Petersen Assistant General Counsel

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Catalado, Richard	04/01/2004	09/30/2007	Professor of Social Work, University of Washington	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Caterson, Edward	04/01/2004	09/30/2007	Professor, Harvard Medical School	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Caulkins, John	04/01/2004	09/30/2007	Professor of Operation Research, Carnegie Mellon University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Fiellin, David	04/01/2004	09/30/2007	Physician	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Fossum, Robert	04/01/2004	09/30/2007	Research Scientist	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Fries, Arthur	04/01/2004	09/30/2007	Statistician	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Harrell, Adele	04/01/2004	09/30/2007	Researcher	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Hatsukami, Dorothy	04/01/2004	09/30/2007	Psychologist	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Incardi, James	04/01/2004	09/30/2007	Professor, Center for Drug and Alcohol Studies, University of Delaware	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Jeffrey, William	04/01/2004	09/30/2007	Government Scientist	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Linder, John	04/01/2004	09/30/2007	Linder & Associates	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Mays, Vickie	04/01/2004	09/30/2007	Psychologist	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Nugent, M.	04/01/2004	09/30/2007	Sociologist	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Wilsnack, Sharon	04/01/2004	09/30/2007	Psychologist	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 14

Narrative Description

To help develop the means to measure the performance of the Agency's various undertakings.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

Improvements to health or safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Trust in government	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advance in scientific research	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Effective grant making	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improved service delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased customer satisfaction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unable to Determine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Under \$100,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$100,000 - \$500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Over \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost Savings Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Cost Savings Comments

Better service does not always translate into cost savings.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

38

Number of Recommendations Comments

Overall Recommendations that Transcend Specific ONDCP Initiatives R1. For its current operational priorities and for any future ones, ONDCP should frame its evaluation approach in terms of a logic structure delineating anticipated outcomes, identifying supporting data elements, sources and measures, thereby constructing series of informative analyses, surveys, experiments, etc. that incorporate lessons learned from previous studies.R2. The process of selecting evaluators and evaluation strategies should

be subject to external, scientific peer review to the extent that it is practical. R3. Evaluation efforts for specific initiatives should link to ongoing monitoring systems such that they can share samples, methods and measures. The information should be available to inform other efforts and disseminated. R4. The magnitude of the investment in research and evaluation of initiatives should be commensurate with the scale (e.g. budget) of the initiative.

National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign R1. Extend the logic model of the media campaign beyond the effect on perceived risk, favorable attitudes, and current use to include projected effects on longer-term use. Also extend the logic model by linking parents to effective resources to improve their monitoring skills. Extend the corresponding outcome measures for any logic model additions. R2. For the media campaign, given the absence of a control group, simple time trend comparisons are not likely to be valid indicators of program success or failure. Valid inferences can only be drawn from careful statistical analysis that controls to the extent possible for covariates and variation in dose. R3. There should be some concomitant assessment of the perceived credibility of the source of the message (e.g. ONDCP) for media and marijuana campaigns, for example through focus groups with target audiences.

25 Cities Initiative R1. Given that this is a capacity building, community organizing intervention, there is a need to include more proximal (e.g. process) measures in addition to the current distal outcome measures. Examples would include asking local partners to assess the extent to which they were empowered to organize, look at their local data and meet the objectives of the initiative. R2. Build on prior knowledge from parallel efforts in related fields (e.g. Fighting Back, Drug Free Communities, CSAP Partnerships and State Incentive Grants) regarding evaluation of community capacity building interventions. R3. Look for ways to take the framework, goals, and objectives of this initiative and extend them to other cities and rural areas.

Marijuana initiative R1. More clearly articulate the logic model(s) on the marijuana initiative (e.g., whether to include a focus on 13-18 year olds and the extent to which marijuana is presumed to act as gateway drug). Extend the corresponding outcome measures for any logic model articulations. R2. Crop production estimates via remote sensing should thoughtfully utilize extensive scientific procedures for analysis and interpretation. The committee recommends reviewing the recommendations from previous Columbian crop eradication estimates study. R3. Conduct an evaluation of the disease burden by substance and direct NIH funding to match this evaluation. R4. Consider molecular biology (e.g. polymerase chain reaction or cannabis linkage map) as a new tool for insight into marijuana distribution networking and prosecution.

Domestic Market Disruption R1. Given that it is difficult to define appropriate and valid performance measures for this effort ONDCP should conduct more “basic” research that is designed to improve understanding of the overall drug production and distribution “systems” (markets). R2. Precisely because it is difficult to define appropriate and valid performance measures, it is important that ONDCP articulate explicit logic models for how domestic market

disruption efforts are expected to achieve the goals of reducing drug use and drug-related consequences. R3. There is an academic literature on networks, network disruption, and network theory that should inform ONDCP's efforts. R4. Efforts to take an economics approach to understand drug markets and disruption of those markets should be grounded in knowledge of specific characteristics of the various different drug markets. R5. Recognize the epidemiological dynamics of drug problems and tie domestic market disruption strategies and efforts to those trends.

Prescription Drug Safety

R1. Perform a formal scientific evaluation of state prescription drug monitoring programs to determine their impact on patient safety and limiting abuse of prescription medications, and to suggest strategies to enhance their effectiveness. R2. Invest more in fundamental research on both the demand and supply side of diverted prescription drugs. R3. It is recommended that the types of larceny and theft in the FBI's uniform crime reporting system be expanded to include prescription drugs. R4. It is recommended that FDA's required risk management program for new drugs be standardized to report on consequences of drug diversion and also extended to drugs already on the market. R5. Work with the DEA to place information on theft and robbery reports of prescription drugs in usable form including an updated system. R6. It is recommended that the NSDUH and other core drug use monitoring instruments (e.g. TEDS, DAWN, Monitoring the Future) be expanded to include the major benzodiazapines, muscle relaxants, sleep aids, and medications to treat erectile dysfunction. R7. Work with NIDA to develop a research agenda on drug abuse resistant pharmaceuticals and precursor chemicals. R8. It is recommended that the ONDCP work with the National Health Informatic Information and Dr. David Brailer to determine ways in which construction of e-prescribing might be useful to the monitoring of the safety, diversion, and abuse of prescription drugs. R9. It is recommend that further epidemiologic surveys and drug use monitoring systems attempt geocoding that allows for a cross over with neighborhood pharmacy availability of pain medications. R10. Create a national data reporting program that aggregates common data elements from the independent state prescription drug monitoring programs along the lines of the current TEDS data system.

Random Student Drug Testing

R1. Perform a series of scientific evaluations of student drug testing to determine its effectiveness. These evaluations should ensure that the independent impact of random and for cause drug testing are selectively evaluated. The conduct of a systematic review or meta-analysis would likely inform such evaluations. R2. Include consideration of impact on educational attainment, extra-curricular activity participation, other positive life outcomes and the long-term implications (e.g. eligibility for educational grants) of being detected with drug use through student drug testing programs. R3. Place questions on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey of the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System conducted by the CDC to determine the extent to which student's self-report that drug testing is a deterrent to participation in school or extracurricular activities. R4. To provide encouragement or

incentives to expand existing drug testing to include prescription drug abuse and/or steroids.Colombia/Mexico/AfghanistanR1. Substantially expand the existing research agenda that attempts to measure the impact of international eradication, seizures, and law enforcement (including the arrest of traffickers) on the distribution and use of substances on the U.S., European and developing countries. Furthermore, where the motivation for these activities includes fostering political stability in source countries, those outcomes should also be part of this research agenda.R2. The committee encourages ONDCP to triangulate data from all available data sources recognizing that ideal data sources rarely exist.R3. Given the importance of having market data from higher market levels, ONDCP is encouraged to promote further collection of price, purity and availability in the source zones including, but above and beyond, that data that are available in STRIDE.R4. Given the importance of monitoring use by hard-core using populations as a final measure of source zone activities as well as other drug control initiatives, ONDCP is encouraged to reconstitute ADAM in some form or identify some other source of biological sample based estimates of use among these populations.Access to RecoveryR1. The committee strongly encourages ONDCP to continue to support SAMHSA's efforts to develop standardized instruments for the 10 National Outcome Measures to ensure comparability of the grantee's efforts and outcomes.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

NA

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

NA

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Agency Feedback Comments

Yes, at subsequent meetings.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Reorganized Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Reallocated resources | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Issued new regulation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Proposed legislation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Approved grants or other payments | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Action Comments

NA

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

No

Grant Review Comments

NA

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Contact DFO | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Online Agency Web Site | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Online Committee Web Site | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Online GSA FACA Web Site | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Publications | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Access Comments

NA